

# NATIONAL REVIEW

## Bulletin

The Good Bomb

p. 3

Rusk: Image and Fact

p. 6

Buy Aircrafts?

p. 8

EDITOR: William F. Buckley Jr. PUBLISHER: William A. Rusher  
EDITORS: L. Brent Hosell, James Burnham,  
Willmoore Kendall, Frank S. Meyer  
MANAGING EDITOR: Priscilla L. Buckley

**W**e are all waiting for President Kennedy (that's the first time we've said it, and it sticks a little. . . . President Kennedy, President Kennedy, President-Kennedy) not to take us to a New Frontier (that was never in prospect, and we are glad he has retired the cliché to the old corral, to graze its life away, after serving so gallantly), but to take us to wherever it is we are supposed to go. We are resigned to moving.

There being no reliable way of knowing where President Kennedy is heading in the next months, most people have given up trying to guess. Others, whose profession is to be sapient, and who have to write an editorial or a column or a newscast every day, have been driven to ponderous analyses on this appointment or that, this secretaryship, that consultant. It is bootless. Men of all stripes are there. By and large it is safe to say the left-ideologues are in the second-ranking positions. But it is not, alas, safe to say that the men in the second-ranking positions automatically exercise second-ranking power. It depends on the quality and character of the first string, and Mr. Kennedy's first string don't look like the kind who could last ten rounds with Harvard's first string. The ideologue has, notoriously, great stamina, more than the easy-going, other-directed technicians who occupy most of the Cabinet posts. On the *other* hand, there is Kennedy. President Kennedy. He is a majority.

Last week, just a few days before the ordeal that will begin on the 20th of January, Mr. Kennedy visited Harvard, ostensibly to contribute to the deliberations of the Board of Overseers (from which he is *not* resigning, to the alarm of the protocol corps), actually to give the boys a thrill—a perfectly human and understandable thing, like those visits by General Eisenhower to West Point. The boys, Pusey, *et al.*, gave him an exuberant welcome. But there was one masterful touch in the whole hectic sequence of events, and we hope the full meaning of it gets inside Kennedy and stays there during the next four years. Next door to University Hall, where he met with the Overseers, stands Weld Hall, where he roomed as a student, twenty years ago. The Overseers' meeting over, Kennedy emerged into a cheering, laughing throng. He was evidently puzzled by the cause of the hilarity. He turned left. Right across Weld Hall the boys had suspended a huge banner: "JACK—WELD HALL IS A DISTRESSED AREA."

## The WEEK

● *The Worker*, the official Communist organ in the United States, has reported to its readers on the Washington demonstrations for and against the House Committee on Un-American Activities, at which the pro-HUAC pickets, by police count, outnumbered the anti-HUAC forces two to one. In *The Worker's* nightmare world, 500 pickets are reported as being against the House Committee. The total turnout of pro-Committee pickets, we learn, was a unit of "20 men dressed in Nazi-type uniforms. They carried signs supporting the committee and calling for killing of 'Jews and Communists.'" *Pravda*, please copy.

● Senator Goldwater proposes six specific revisions in the labor law (and in the Civil Service Code) to protect the rights and strengthen the leverage of the individual worker. The proposals are: 1) no right to exclusive representation for any union barring qualified workers from membership; 2) no use of union funds for political purposes; 3) crackdown on the use of violence in labor disputes; 4) help, without court action, by a government agency to any union member seeking to bring a complaint against a union; 5) on demand of 30 per cent of the members of a union, a secret vote on initiating or continuing a strike; 6) grievance machinery for federal employees (often victimized, without power of appeal, by their immediate bosses). The response to these proposals in the days ahead will distinguish those primarily interested in the rights of the workingman from the mere Union Firsters.

● Last spring, a gaudy full-page ad in the *New York Times* attracted considerable attention. It was a plea to the American community to revise our unfriendly attitude toward Fidel Castro, and was signed by a dozen or more conspicuous political birdbrains, the whole under the auspices of the "Fair Play for Cuba Committee." One of

the signers, Kenneth Tynan the critic, gave notoriety to the episode by recounting in heroic pentameter the grievous consequences that overtook him as the result of his signing the advertisement, namely, he was called before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and asked such preposterous questions as, Did he know where the money came from to pay for the ad? Last week the self-same Committee released testimony establishing that two-thirds of the money for the ad came in cash from—Fidel Castro, via “Raulito” Roa, the son of Raúl Roa, Castro’s representative at the United Nations. What the boys were gulled into signing was, indeed, a Fair Play for Me manifesto.



Behrendt, *Algemeen Handelsblad*, Amsterdam

Here we go again . . .

● John F. Kennedy took a break the other day to address, non-jointly, the Massachusetts Legislature and the Harvard Board of Overseers. In his speech to the lawmakers, Jack urged upon the land his own strict moral code, which, he allows straight-faced, derives from “New England ideals.” It was old John Winthrop, along with assorted “Pilgrims and Puritans,” who fashioned the Kennedy morality. A strict-constructionist among moralists, the future chief-exec made his point with *Pericles to the Athenians*. “We do not imitate,” quoth Jack, “for we are a model to others.” There was a snappy meeting of the Overseers (where it was observed that the last Massachusetts man to serve as both Overseer and President was John Quincy Adams, doubtless another Kennedy spiritual ancestor), a limp handshake with Nathan Pusey and the inevitable *scanc* with Arthur Schlesinger Jr. But it was short and sweet, because the neo-descendant of Puritans had a date in New York with some Pilgrims from the *old* frontier, headed up by Frank Sinatra and Peter Lawford, who had been at the Copa discussing affairs of state with a couple of other friends of the Kennedys, Mr. & Mrs. Sammy Davis Jr. All were looking forward to the big inauguration blast. May the shades of John Winthrop and his *Arabella* shipmates be easeful, in the knowledge that their ideals rest in the willing hands of so stern a group of moralists!

● Conservatives, taking Senator Goldwater’s message to heart, are not waiting for 1964 to start working to regain

control of their political parties. Evidence of a new enthusiasm on the Right is the overflow success of the recent political-action conference sponsored by *Human Events*, the conservative Washington newsletter. Originally planned for 500 delegates (each paying a \$75 registration fee), the meetings had to be moved to larger quarters when 700 to 800 persons showed up. Conservative freshman congressmen, such as Donald Bruce of Indiana and John Ashbrook of Ohio, gave step-by-step accounts of how they organized the campaigns that brought them into office. Seasoned conservative politicians like Senators Barry Goldwater and Strom Thurmond addressed the conference, along with Washington newsmen Constantine Brown, Ralph de Toledano, Willard Edwards and Fulton Lewis Jr.

● As Dag Hammarskjöld arrived at UN headquarters in Léopoldville last week, massed supporters of Soviet-backed Patrice Lumumba raised their banners: “Free Lumumba!” “Long Live Dag H., Secretary General of the United Nations!” They did not cheer in vain. Once inside, the Secretary General’s urgent topics of discussion were “due process” for the imprisoned Lumumba; the need for President Kasavubu to invite Lumumba to the Congolese roundtable called for January 25, and the desirability of reconvening the parliament stacked with Lumumba supporters and terrorized by his followers, among whom the assassins and cannibals figure so prominently. As he conferred within, the Lumumba mobs outside beat up various of President Kasavubu’s followers, including Kasavubu’s private secretary, until (AP) there was “blood streaming from their faces.” “The UN troops did not interfere with the mob scenes,” the press further reported; “several UN soldiers were observed taking snapshots.” Meanwhile, with the benevolent neutrality of the UN contingents in the area, pro-Lumumba troops in Oriental Province, directed by Antoine Gizenga, a Communist, crossed into northern Katanga, and began slaughtering anti-Lumumba tribesmen under UN eyes. On Oriental’s northern border, UN troops successfully interfered with an invasion attempt by units of Colonel Mobutu’s army directed against Gizenga. There was no interference with landings of Soviet Ilyushin propjets, loaded with weapons, supplies and personnel, from the Czech, USSR and UAR air forces. During his week of traveling, Dag found time to send and publicize two fierce denunciations—of Belgium; for endangering Congolese peace.

● When French customs officials in a routine search of a plane from Belgrade turned up 40 Mausers, a score or more of assorted rifles and ammunitions, their exasperation knew no bounds. The gall of those Yugoslavs to try to ship arms to the Algerian rebels via Orly airport. The cargo was impounded, the passengers and crew members rounded up and a diplomatic incident well on the way to the making when someone suggested looking at the cargo manifest. The arms, it turned out, were the property of a French film company which had been shooting a movie about commandos, on location near Belgrade.

## Morality and H-bombs

Two hundred school headmistresses, gathered in conference, might have seemed a curious audience to pick for an official declaration on nuclear weapons systems, but Harold Watkinson, Britain's Minister of Defense, was in truth discussing morality, not H-bombs. His words were a refreshing and exciting novelty in a public context wherein the Linus Paulings, Bertrand Russells, Norman Cousins and sundry beatniks have been routinely accepted on their self-appointment as the only qualified moral philosophers of the atom.

What Mr. Watkinson told his teachers was that we should be thankful, grateful, to nuclear weapons, for they alone in the past fifteen years blocked the atheist and totalitarian Communist enterprise from overrunning the earth. And by an unforeseen paradox, they do more than this: by the very immensity of their unparalleled destructive potential, and the fear on both sides that this might be set into action, they have served to prevent the resort to large-scale "conventional war," and to brake and check the lesser fighting that from time to time occurs.

"If we do away with nuclear weapons," Mr. Watkinson patiently explained, "we open the way once again to war as an instrument in the hands of ruthless aggressors. We call it conventional war, but this cozy phrase masks its real beastliness. Can we really say that the threat of mutual nuclear annihilation is an unmitigated moral evil if it saves us from horrors of this magnitude? Of course it is not. To be a nuclear power is a heavy burden to bear, but . . . we should not shirk our responsibility."

And having certainly in mind the loose demagoguery with which Britain's unilateral disarmers agitate among her youth, he asked his audience, which was perhaps not so inappropriate after all, to discuss these matters, responsibly and calmly, with their charges.

## Rocky Keeps His Oar In

Nelson Rockefeller appears to be able to get away with almost anything. The sheer cynicism of his recent maneuver (copied from the standard operating procedure of New York governors since colonial days, and predicted by NATIONAL REVIEW several times during the last year) goes unremarked. He overtaxes one year (on purpose), and plays Santa Claus the next (on schedule); and the voters and editorial writers drool. . . And in the middle of everything, he increases his call for state welfarism.

Some of his proposals (e.g., an increase in park areas) are indisputably attractive; some (e.g., medical insurance) would be understandable if he were to present them as alternatives to federal action; some (e.g., his plan to improve commuting service) are worth debating; others (e.g., state aid to middle income housing) are indefensible in a society committed to solve those of its problems it possibly can, without reference to the state. However—as Senator Goldwater has said about Rockefeller—at least

**PEOPLE:** Good news, the assignment of hard anti-Communist Sen. **Thomas Dodd** to all-important Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Dodd gave up seat on Appropriations Committee in exchange. . . . Southern Democrats indicated they'd move to get **Adam Clayton Powell Jr.** ousted as chairman of House Education and Labor Committee if the Liberals persisted in their attempt to purge **William Colmer** (D., Miss.) from House Rules Committee. . . . Biggest surprise of week, Sen. **William Proxmire's** wide-swinging attack on anti-recession-by-spending recommendations of **Samuelson** task force. . . . Reintroduced, **Herlong-Baker** bill to reduce income tax rates over a five-year-period, lowering top rate of 91 per cent to 47 per cent by 1965. . . . **Douglas Dillon's** appointment as Secretary of Treasury unpopular with British, who suspect he supports Common Market (which he favored when ambassador to France). . . .

Anti-Goldwater moves by Republican Liberals at GOP get-togethers in Washington recently died a-borning. Goldwater retained important job as chairman of Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee, with support of staunch GOP Liberals like **Margaret Chase Smith**; he beat down suggestion of New York's Liberal **Kenneth Keating** that GOP set up policy board to parallel Democratic Advisory Council. (Goldwater position is that policy-making function should remain in hands of National Committee and Congress members). . . . Crack of the week, **Hubert Humphrey** to Goldwater: "Barry, you're so handsome, you ought to star in a movie. I'm going to send your name to Eighteenth Century Fox." . . . **Nixon** hedging over whether he'll run for governor of California in '62 with good reason. The party's still split in California and Republicans are heavily outnumbered.

Dr. **Bela Fabian**, who predicted **Khrushchev** would visit U.S. last fall, says the Soviet Premier will return to America in March. Khrushchev will stay in country six weeks if necessary in attempt to get face-to-face meeting with President **Kennedy**. . . . Two Sikorsky helicopters, similar to one Khrushchev and **Eisenhower** rode in during Camp David meeting, were delivered to Soviet Premier early this month. . . . On sale throughout West Germany, new gold coins issued on **Konrad Adenauer's** 85th birthday, bearing the inscription: "*Pater Patriae Germanicae*". . . . Dr. **Salvador Garcia Agüero**, newly appointed Cuban ambassador to Guinea, is first acknowledged Communist Party member to be given high post. . . . *New York Times* reporter **Herbert L. Matthews** (*Pater Patriae Cubane?*), at recent Yale seminar, asserted he had written every *Times* editorial on Latin America in last two years.



here's a man who intends to pay for his extravagances, and who has exactly that understanding with the voters. Even so—as both Goldwater and Walter Reuther have said—he might feel more at home in the Democratic Party.

## Americans Are Not Israelis

Jews throughout the world have been gravely, and rightly, agitated by an address delivered by Israeli Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion to the 25th Zionist Congress, meeting in Jerusalem. Ben-Gurion took as his primary text a quotation from the Talmud: "Whoever dwells outside the land of Israel is considered to have no God, the sages said." "Since the day when the Jewish state was established," he amplified, "and the gates of Israel were flung open to every Jew who wanted to come, every religious Jew has daily violated the precepts of Judaism . . . by remaining in the Diaspora [i.e., in exile]." In uncompromising terms he insisted that "a personal bond with Israel . . . is the elementary duty of those who inscribe the name of Zion on their banner," that all-Jews of the world, if they do not immediately fulfill their own duty of *aliya* (immigration), must invest capital in Israel, send their sons and daughters there, speak Hebrew as their common language, recognize Israel's redemptive, Messianic role.

Ben-Gurion is not himself an Orthodox Jew (or Religious Jew, as the Orthodox are known in Israel), and the theoretical basis of his remarks was starkly visible: the Jews constitute a single people in a historical and political sense; Palestine, and Palestine alone, is this people's homeland; Israel is this people's nation, and Israel's government its government; when the government of Israel speaks, it speaks not only for its resident citizens but for all Jews everywhere.

The implications were not obscure to leading American Jews. Although several prominent rabbis—among them Dr. Judah Nadich, Dr. Israel Margolies, Dr. Louis I. Newman—defended Ben-Gurion's words, many American Jewish spokesmen immediately and sharply rejected Ben-Gurion's doctrines. The non-Zionist American Jewish Committee declared that they violated an explicit undertaking made to the Committee ten years ago. The anti-Zionist American Council for Judaism's president, Clarence L. Coleman Jr., called them "fantastic nonsense," a sign of Zionism's "desperation." Mr. Coleman went on to draw the line clearly: "Our nationality is American, our religion is Judaism. Our homeland is the United States of America, and we reject the concept that all Jews outside of Israel are in 'exile.'" The repudiations were supplemented in more discreet language by several Zionist groups, by the chiefs of Reform Judaism, and by a number of individual rabbis.

These doctrines are Ben-Gurion's settled conviction, and Mr. Coleman is surely correct in finding that they are incompatible with U. S. citizenship (or citizenship in any foreign state other than Israel itself). There are more Jews in our country than in all the rest of the

## • At Home •

Washington

Along the Potomac, all is confusion, apprehension, and anger.

*Item.* President-elect Kennedy is furious at President Eisenhower for breaking off relations with Fidel Castro and the Cuban Communist regime. This long-delayed action has closed the door to a planned policy of appeasement in the Caribbean which State Department experts, working with onetime diplomat A. A. Berle, were sugarcoating for the American public. Now Mr. Kennedy cannot figuratively "go to Havana"—as he had intended—to "end" the cold war between Cuba and the United States. Mr. Berle, it is not generally known, had been offered the post of Assistant Secretary for Latin American Affairs, but had been bargaining for an Under Secretaryship in the State Department. The diplomatic break has made his brand of "sophisticated anti-Communism" and his thesis that we should not be beastly to the *fidelistas* of less value to the incoming Administration.

*Item.* Already divided along north-south and Liberal-conservative lines, Senate Democrats are up in arms over Mr. Kennedy's invasion of the upper chamber. This is how members of both party wings interpret the steamroller proceedings in the Democratic caucus which elected Vice President-elect Lyndon Johnson its chairman. Mr. Johnson is now a member of the Executive Branch, and his intrusion into the Legislative Branch is not only unprecedented but a violation of the constitutional principle of the separation of powers. It is reported here that Mr. Johnson, who is cannily aware of senatorial prerogatives, was sandbagged by Mr. Kennedy into forcing himself down the throats of his former colleagues. He looked visibly embarrassed during the acrimonious discussion preceding his election.

*Item.* Proponents of a sound fiscal policy are worried over the spate of "reports" to Mr. Kennedy calling for increased federal spending, tax cuts, and a heavily unbalanced budget. Ten billion dollars for federal aid-to-education, \$5 billion to "end the recession," and an unspecified number of billions for housing are being urged—in addition to a regular budget of \$82 billion—as well as a reduction in taxes, the brainchild of the AFL-CIO, amounting to \$5 billion in unemployment increases. When Vice President Nixon predicted that the Kennedy program would cost \$17 billion a year, the Democrats protested loudly—but if the planners have their way, this will be chicken feed.

*Item.* Agricultural advisers of Mr. Kennedy are dusting off the "food stamp" plan of New Deal days, hoping that it will help reduce farm surpluses. Under this plan, the needy will be given stamps which they can exchange for

surplus foods. Whatever the merits or demerits of this plan, it will require a corps of bureaucrats to determine who is needy and who isn't. No one has yet explained why the criterion of poverty should be acceptable here, whereas it is considered reprehensible (Mr. Kennedy wept over "paupers' oaths" during the campaign) in the area of medical care for the aged. Perhaps the answer may be that the "medicare" plan, putting the program under Social Security, is a long step toward the regimentation of the medical profession.

*Item.* Two of the three men appointed to serve under Labor Secretary Arthur Goldberg as Assistant Secretaries are active trade union officials. One of them comes from the power-hungry International Union of Electrical Workers. This infiltration of the Labor Department is causing some concern on Capitol Hill. For it is the department's function to police many trade union activities. With the unions running the Labor Department, it can be anticipated that the Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin Acts will become dead letters. Major labor policy decisions will be made by AFL-CIO President George Meany and UAW President Walter Reuther, for government rubber-stamping.

*Item. Behind the scenes,* king-maker Joseph Kennedy is hard at work trying to blunt the expected attack on the appointment of his son Bobby to the post of Attorney General. Few on the Hill have forgotten that as counsel for the Senate Labor Rackets Committee, Bobby Kennedy was brusque and cavalier in his dealings with senators. Civil liberties groups, moreover, fear that he will continue to disregard due process. Now Kennedy *père* has been calling his friends among the older, more conservative senators, asking them to refrain from hostile questioning when Bobby comes up for confirmation. The elder Kennedy has even dropped a hint to former Senator Burton K. Wheeler, still moving in Washington legislative circles, that there is a Justice Department position for him. What will come of the attacks on Bobby and other of the Kennedy appointments is problematical. "We'll approve the whole kettle of fish," one senator remarked, "the Harvard eggheads and the Truman hacks—but we'll light a fire under it first."

*Item.* On the Republican side, trouble is brewing between House Minority Leader Charles Halleck and a group of young conservative representatives. Mr. Halleck is determined to cut Richard Nixon out of party deliberations—reportedly because he has Presidential ambitions of his own. The young group is disturbed because Mr. Halleck is making his antagonism toward Mr. Nixon a matter of public record. There are many responsible Republicans critical of Mr. Nixon, but they have not taken to *Meet The Press* to air their disagreements.

QUINCY

world. After the provocation of Ben-Gurion's address—for it must be so interpreted—it would be proper for this point to be made publicly by an official statement of our government, as well as by the unofficial utterance of private citizens, Jewish and non-Jewish alike. The hideous and perverted passion of anti-Semitism is constructed from distortions, falsehoods, delusions and neuroses. It would be disastrous to offer it truths to feed on.

**BRIEFS:** In sealed files arriving in Washington from U.S. Embassy in Cuba, more than 50,000 applications from Cubans for visas to United States. . . . Canadian businessmen engaged in Cuban trade now informed by Castro aides that this is *not* a cash on delivery situation. . . . British printing firm last week delivered to Cuba 35 crates of new peso notes (the paper alone weighing 7,900 pounds). . . . **January 1st interest on \$45 million Cuban government bonds defaulted.** . . . Peso, nominally equal to dollar, about 1-4 on black market, and sinking fast. . . . Panama has forbidden both pro and anti-Castro elements to engage in any propaganda activity.

Private sources in America, in 1960, gave more than \$8 billion to charity, the highest sum ever. . . . **The NAACP received \$985,731 in contributions in '60; spent \$1,290,000.** . . . The National Student Committee for Congressional Autonomy organized last week in Evanston, Ill. First goal: to fight Operation Abolition, Communist-encouraged campaign to do away with HUAC. . . . After University of Bridgeport (Conn.) paper came out with vicious attack on HUAC, Connecticut Anti-Communist Committee arranged to have documentary ("operation abolition") on San Francisco riots shown at University.

Britain has refused to allow UAR to open consulates in Kenya, Uganda, Tanganyika and Aden. Egyptian diplomatic offices have, in past, been used to foment anti-British sentiment. . . . Six months after Congo Independence Day, only three of original six states still pay allegiance to central government. . . . **Part and parcel of Belgian economic crisis, its effort to absorb into economy 86,000 Congo refugees.** . . . Norwegian youth organizations no longer sending youth groups to Russia because their delegations never allowed to contact Soviet youth.

*Gallic je ne sais quoi:* New French legislation provides that persons convicted of living on immoral earnings shall lose their driving licenses.

NATIONAL REVIEW is published weekly by National Review, Inc., at 440 Post Road, Orange, Conn. (second class mail privileges authorized at Orange, Conn.). Copyright 1961 in the U.S.A., by National Review, Inc. All manuscripts, letters, subscription orders, changes of address and undeliverable copies should be sent to:

**EDITORIAL AND CIRCULATION OFFICES**  
National Review  
150 East 35th St., New York 16, N.Y.  
Telephone ORegon 9-7330

RATES: \$15.00 a year (\$8.00 for the 32-page issues, and \$7.00 for the 8-page issues published on the alternate fortnight). The 8-page issues are available separately at \$10.00 a year. In all cases, add \$1.00 for Canada, \$2.00 for other foreign subscriptions.

## • Trends •

**Secretary of State-designate** Dean Rusk has been the beneficiary of one of the most successful public-relations campaigns of recent memory. In spite of a record suggesting remarkable softness on the question of Communism, he is receiving an excellent press as a tough-minded diplomat who will stand up to the Soviets.

The effect is achieved by ignoring the bulk of Rusk's identifiable performance as an official in the Truman State Department, and concentrating on two episodes which, casually appraised, can be turned to Rusk's advantage.

The new secretary was an integral part of the Acheson group which helped nudge China into Communism in the 1940s. Indeed, he was one of the more ardent promoters of the theory that Mao Tse-tung and company were idealists in the pattern of the American revolution. In a speech delivered January 13, 1950, he suggested that the despots in Peiping were comparable to the American patriots of 1776, that their revolution was "not Russian in essence, but . . . subject to perversion," and that there was a "conflict coming between Chinese nationalism and Russian imperialism masquerading as world Communism."

Such sentiments coming from a Deputy Under Secretary of State, commented the *Washington Post*, "made it clear that U.S. policy is based upon the hope that even Communist movements can be kept out of Soviet control, and indicated that so long as nationalist movements—Communist or otherwise—are not Soviet-controlled, the United States may deal with them."

The practiced anti-Communist will recognize this position as an amalgam of the most vulgar errors in the Liberal repertoire—combining a hopeless theoretical misunderstanding (that we are threatened, not by Communism, but by "Russian imperialism") with a cavalier misrepresentation of the facts about the regime in Peiping.

It is noteworthy that this revealing speech has been largely ignored. Public attention has been directed, instead, to another Rusk speech, delivered in May 1951, and to an article he published in the April 1960 issue of *Foreign Affairs*. These statements challenged, respectively, the legitimacy of the Chinese Communist government, and the wisdom of "Summit" conferences. Both, on first encounter, suggest that Rusk is a hard-headed anti-Communist. Both, on closer inspection, show that the case is otherwise.

Parenthetically, it is interesting to speculate on the reasons for the attention lavished on Rusk's so-called "anti-Communist" speech. Like the 1950 address bracketing Mao with Patrick Henry, it is distant enough in time to bear no necessary resemblance to the secretary's present views. Why concentrate on it to the exclusion of the first? If one is important in forming an assessment of the new secretary, both are. If either may be dismissed as irrelevant, both may be.

In any event, the "anti-Communist" speech is not in fact anti-Communist, and indeed bears a remarkable similarity, in its assessment of international Bolshevism, to the "soft"

one. To his credit, Rusk attacked the Peiping Chinese, and opined that the government on Formosa more nearly suited American notions of a legitimate regime. This is the point which has been getting all the attention.

What has been getting no attention at all, but what should be getting plenty, is the reasoning behind the attack. The Communist despotism was evil, Rusk said, not because it was Communist, but because it was "not Chinese." He emphasized that his objection had little to do with the question of Communism, everything to do with the matter of "Russian imperialism": "*If the Chinese move to assert their freedom to work out their destiny in accordance with their own historical purposes, they can count on tremendous support from free peoples in the other parts of the world.*"

On comparison, this utterance represents no improvement in understanding from Rusk's views of the preceding year. The difference between the two speeches arises from a changed estimate of the empirical balance of forces. In the first speech, the Chinese revolution was good, but "subject to perversion" if Russian imperialism got the better of it; in the second, the anticipated "perversion" had transpired, native aspirations (including, presumably, native Communist aspirations) had been squelched, and the regime was "not Chinese." The theoretical premises had not changed; what were conceived as new "facts" were simply fitted into the same distorted mould of ideology.

**If the May 1951 speech** does represent Rusk's present views, it appears to mean he would supply "tremendous support" to the Chinese Communists if there were a split between Moscow and Peiping, and the Chinese began working things out "according to their own historical purposes." Curiously enough, it is now the vogue, among all foreign policy specialists with whom Rusk is known to consort, to maintain that just such a split exists. Are we thus justified in interpreting this speech as an augury of hard-nosed anti-Communism?

The publicity about Rusk's article on "Summit" conferences is similarly misleading. The article contains much with which we may agree, but it in no sense represents a tough view on the question of Communism. Rusk simply argues that the burdens of the Presidency, and the intricate calculus of motives involved in international negotiation, make top-level meetings unwise.

These observations are true enough, but have little to do with Communism. To the anti-Communist the real objections to Summity are not procedural but substantive: that it attempts to negotiate what can and should not be negotiated; that it places a moral outlaw on equal footing with the President of the United States; that it demoralizes captive nations looking to America as a focus of resistance.

Rusk's discussion sticks impeccably to technicalities, and tells us nothing about these substantive issues. Such an omission, in such an exhaustive discussion, does not suggest a keen anti-Communist mentality.

M. STANTON EVANS



## • Abroad •

**Tunis.** The GPRA (Provisional Government of the Algerian Republic—i.e., of Ferhat Abbas and the FLN) is aware of an ironic and delicate problem that has escaped notice in Europe and the United States. Everyone understands how supremely difficult would be the position of the million and a half Europeans in an Algeria wholly independent of and presumptively hostile to France. But few keep in mind that there are nearly a million North African Moslems in metropolitan France. What would happen to them in the event of massive anti-European terror in Algeria?

**Brussels.** The foreign, particularly the American, press has reported the massive strike movement to be motivated by opposition to the "austerity program" enacted in December by the Van Eyskens government. In reality, that program—a moderate and equitable response to the existing economic situation—was merely seized on as an excuse and cover for a political operation designed to demoralize the nation and overturn the government. In part the sources trace back to the traditional conflict between the Walloons and the Flemish, the Left Socialists of the southern industrial cities and the anti-Marxist Catholics who predominate in the Parliament, the anti-monarchists and those who accept or support the monarchy. But on this occasion there has also been added the active support and in many cases the leadership of Communists who have provoked the crowds into rioting, sabotage and bloodshed, causing a state of almost irreconcilable bitterness.

**Geneva.** There is a sizable though unvociferous wing of European economists that judges the Belgian general strike to be the augury of a deep general economic depression in the Atlantic community, inclusive of both Western Europe and America. Among other omens are listed the gathering U.S. recession; the dollar crisis; sharp decline in the European auto industry, especially in France and England; increasing tensions in the West German economy; stickiness in international trade; large declines recently in nearly all major stock exchanges.

**Bombay.** During the second half of 1960, the new anti-Marxist, pro-Western Swatantra Party, headed by Rajakopalachari, K. M. Munshi, N. C. Chatterjee and M. R. Masani, extended its organizing activities to nearly all Indian states. The venerable Rajaji traveled widely in Kerala, Madras and elsewhere, and spoke, as is customary for India's recognized sages, to hundreds of thousands. Several novel methods of campaigning have been successfully developed. An Anti-Inflation Day was celebrated simultaneously in hundreds of towns all over the country, with meetings, petitions, resolutions, etc. In the state of Uttar Pradesh, Swatantra leaders toured with "a music party" which opened meetings—averaging 5,000 attendance—with folk songs, and poems describing the troubles of the people resulting from government policies.

**Vientiane, Laos.** British and French observers have long been convinced of the unwisdom of the American mode of intervention into Laotian affairs. It has, they believe, been much too massive, for one thing: too much money, too many arms, too much personnel for so small a country to absorb usefully. A much *smaller* army, in small units, trained for jungle and guerrilla fighting and backed by a special internal security force, would have been more suited to the geopolitical realities. Fewer but lasting and more directly appreciable aid projects (roads, small factories, a hospital or two) would have paid sounder economic and political dividends. Both French and British believe that the idea of an actively pro-Western Laos on the border of China and North Vietnam is an absurdity; that a buffer, neutral (not necessarily "neutralist") Laos is the best that can be or could have been hoped for.



Tarental Press

**London.** The leftwing *New Statesman* has in each issue a department called "This England," with three or four quotations illustrating what the editors, and their average reader, accept as an absurd or ludicrous expression of the Establishment (Blimpism). In the issue of January 6, one quote is from a letter to the *Daily Telegraph*: "Among the names of those who support 'unilateral' (or in plainer English, 'one-sided') nuclear disarmament I see some who simultaneously support other strange causes. These include the abolition of capital punishment for murder, abandonment of overseas territories long before they are ready to look after themselves (and regardless of the safety of our compatriots), blind support of the palsied United Nations and denigration of the vital shield of NATO, condonation of homosexual practices, premature release of dangerous lunatics, no corporal punishment for young criminals, sale of near-pornography to all and sundry, suppression of boxing and hunting, and so forth—practically all of which measures could well have been specifically designed by our enemies for our national undoing." The intuitive consistency with which the writer of this letter lists the current manifestations of that abstract humanitarianism which represents the West's impulse toward suicide is exactly matched by the sensitivity with which the abstractly humanitarian editors select it as apt for ridicule.

## • The Investor •

**The environment in which** the aircraft industry formerly operated has changed drastically in the past four years. The industry, whose primary function has been the production of fighter planes, found the adjustment to the missile-space age difficult. In addition, those same four years saw Douglas Aircraft, Lockheed Aircraft and General Dynamics fighting to maintain their position in the civilian transport field against the interloper, Boeing Airplane Company. Boeing, with an extensive large-jet experience, had an important headstart on the others. It's estimated that these four major airline companies dropped 800 million (pre-tax) dollars in the battle. This loss hardly encouraged investor enthusiasm.

Those few institutions which had thought that they had discerned in aircraft a vigorous young industry, resistant to recession and with important growth characteristics, rushed for the exits, selling their aircraft stocks for any price they could get. This touched off a near panic in aircraft stock prices.

The Administration's understandable concern for a balanced budget took its toll in procurement programs, and contributed to the general gloom. Aircraft production programs were cancelled. Company earnings suffered sharp setbacks. Only a few investors showed any comprehension of the industry's underlying strengths and purchased aero-missile-space shares on the decline. Even today, the conventional viewer looks at the aircraft industry as highly speculative since it is wholly dependent on one undependable customer, the U.S. Government. Hopes or fears of disarmament contribute to most investors' distrust of the aircraft shares.

Yet there is another way the aero-space business can be appraised, and there is growing evidence that this appraisal has validity.

It has become increasingly clear that investigation of space will soak up all funds which its drain on our economy will permit. Space projects requiring study are limitless, both in number and dollar requirement. No matter how rapidly our economy may grow, the demands of space for money will absorb all dollars available, including those today spent on defense, in the unlikely event that large-scale disarmament ever becomes possible.

Why do we investigate space? Why not instead spend on improving life on this planet? Because man's urge to explore the unknown has always been one of his strongest impulses, and still is, and because much of what we discover in the process of exploring space can be and will be utilized to improve life on Earth. In addition, much of the knowledge acquired will be capable of military application.

The Eisenhower Administration cut essential military and space programs. The cuts were to help balance the national budget. But a more realistic look at the situation indicates that, far from saving money, the stopping and restarting of necessary space programs which would have

to be undertaken at some point, increased their ultimate cost.

The Eisenhower Administration in its last days began to respond to the public demand for increased defense-space expenditure. It is reported to have decided to undertake development of a new cargo turbine-jet airplane; a 2,000 mile-per-hour passenger transport; resumption of work on the 2,000 mile-an-hour B-70 bomber; development of a low-level supersonic attack fighter-bomber and of a nuclear-powered airplane. In addition, a purchase of a quantity of present passenger jets, converted to cargo planes, is planned.

The SRO 182 new-design turbine-jet cargo plane, if ordered in the quantity needed to give our military forces efficient mobility for the jet age, will run into billions of dollars over a period of years, as will large-scale purchases of the B-70 and the low-level supersonic fighter. The supersonic passenger plane may cost \$1 billion for development alone.

The above dollar requirement does not include any provision for researching and building missiles and space vehicles. The Minute Man alone can run into billions of dollars, as can the Dyna Soar. The Polaris program is another multi-billion dollar project. The trend in missile-space spending is definitely up.

In addition to all the known programs, there are a number of multi-billion dollar defense and space projects still in the planning stage. Some of these will be born and will mature.

**The aero-missile-space** companies face a decade of certainty that the volume of business for the industry will grow. This does not mean every company will prosper. It does mean that those corporations which can make important contributions in knowledge, in effective and economical design, manufacture, assembly, testing and ground installation will grow in sales, earnings and assets.

Most conservative investors and institutions today eschew all shares of aircraft companies on the ground that this industry has too many inescapable hazards. Yet it is now becoming evident to some investors that these hazards are no greater than the different risks inherent in many industries in which they already invest.

Certainly there are hazards in investing in steel, automobiles, in paper or aluminum or in the oil industry. The excess of production capacity in these industries has brought problems of no small magnitude.

The aero-space-missile industry does not face this kind of risk. It appears to be recession-proof. Perhaps it is fair to conclude that investors are beginning to appreciate that it is their unfamiliarity with the industry which makes them unduly apprehensive about investing in it. The changed environment for the aero-missile-space industry promises that, within the next few years, its shares will have a wide institutional ownership. This cannot take place without an important rise in share prices of a few of the better-managed aircraft companies.

NORVIN R. GREENE



